

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is filed in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed July 21, 2004. In the Office Action, claims 1-23, 25-39 and 109-153 were rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 9, 13-14, 37, 119 and 152 have been amended and claims 38-39, 109-118, 120-121, 124-125, 138, 149 and 151 have been canceled. As such, claims 1-23, 25-37, 119, 122-123, 126-137, 139-148, 150 and 152-153 are pending and should be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the above-identified claims is now respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 21, 22, 25, 26, 31, 109, 110, 119, 120, 124, 125 and 137 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Pool (U.S. Patent No. 5,702,115).

Applicant respectfully submits that Pool does not disclose the limitations recited with respect to claims 1, 119 and 152. In particular, Pool fails to disclose a mobile safety compliance apparatus that includes at least one selectively removable door wherein the at least one of selectively removable door is adapted for use as a stretcher, as articulated in claims 1 and 119.

Similarly, Pool fails to disclose a mobile safety compliance apparatus comprising at least one door selectively attached to a housing wherein the at least one door is selectively removable and configured to be used as a stretcher, as articulated in claim 152. Further, Pool fails to disclose electronic communication equipment stored in a housing, as articulated in claim 152.

Thus, Pool fails to anticipate claims 1, 119 and 152. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be removed from the above-referenced claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 7, 30, 111, 122, 123, 133, 134 and 136 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Rigo (U.S. Patent No. 5,820,143). Claims 8, 9, 37, 112 and 113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Walker (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,949). Claims 10 and 121 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Kos (U.S. Patent No. 5,833,330). Claims 11, 12, 14, 17, 114, 126 and 127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No. 5,518,258). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Tisbo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,975,660). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox and Insalaco et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,605,344). Claims 18-20, 38, 115 and 138-148 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Stein (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,626). Claims 23, 32-35, 116, 118, 128, 129, 131, 149 and 151 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Silva (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,302). Claims 27, 28 and 132 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No. 6,220,610). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Cox ('610) and Haley (U.S. Patent No.

6,131,929). Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Stein and Silva. Claims 117 and 150 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Haley. Claim 130 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Silva and Haley. Claim 135 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Tagg (U.S. Design No. 391,343). Claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool in view of Kaish et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,928).

Applicant respectfully submits that the references of record do not teach or suggest the limitations recited with respect to claim 37. In particular, the references of record fail to teach or suggest a mobile safety compliance apparatus that includes a plurality of selectively removable doors hingedly linked to a shell wherein at least one of the plurality of selectively removable doors is adapted for use as a stretcher, as articulated in claim 37. As such, claim 37 is pending and should be in condition for allowance. Removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to the above-identified claims is now respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the response and amendments submitted herein, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-23, 25-37, 119, 122-123, 126-137, 139-148, 150 and 152-153 are in condition for allowance. As such, reconsideration of the rejections is requested and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully solicited.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21 day of December, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN C. STRINGHAM
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,831

Customer No. 022913
Phone No.: (801) 533-9800

DFR0000007003V001